

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DONALD R. HINTON, SR. and DAVID  
HINTON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
DEPARTMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:14-cv-00842-RFB-GWF

**ORDER**

The Court has received the parties' Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order Submitted in Compliance with LR 26-1(e) (#28) filed September 4, 2014. LR 26-1(e)(1) sets a period of 180 days as a presumptively reasonable amount of time in which to conduct discovery. Discovery plans requesting longer than 180 days from the date the first defendant answers or appears require special scheduling review. LR 26-1(d) is explicit:

Plans requesting special scheduling review shall include, in addition to the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(e), a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case or, in cases in which the parties disagree as to the form or contents of the discovery plan, a statement of each party's position on each point in dispute.

The parties having failed to comply with the requirements of LR 26-1. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the parties' Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (#28) is denied, without prejudice.

...

...

...

1           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties are to file a revised Discovery Plan and  
2 Scheduling Order in compliance with LR 26-1, including any request for special scheduling review,  
3 within seven (7) days of the date of this order.

4           DATED this 5th day of September, 2014.

5  
6           

7           \_\_\_\_\_  
8           GEORGE FOLEY, JR.  
9           United States Magistrate Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28